

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 20 continue to be in the case.

The Office Action refers to *Claim Objections*

Claims 7,9-15,17-20 stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from another multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01 (n). Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merits.

Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Examiner is in so far correct as the translation of the PCT application contains multiply dependent claims. However, on February 2, 2006 applicants filed a preliminary amendment of 7 pages with the United States Patent and Trademark Office and which amendment eliminated all multiple dependent claims. Apparently due to an oversight this preliminary amendment was not considered at the time the above objection was composed. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 7, 9 to 15 and 17 to 20 and withdrawal of the objection.s.

The Office Action refers to Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102.

Claims 1,3,5/(3,1) stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the admitted prior art (APA). Page 3, lines 1-3 of applicant's specification disclose the subject matter of these claims.

Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 1 as amended requires the presence of "mixing elements (4) associated with the coating (3)". No mixing elements are part of the admitted prior art (APA). Claim 5 requires that "wherein mixing elements (4) are disposed at predetermined

distances (A) on the elongated cylindrical section (7).". There is no teaching or suggestion in the admitted Prior Art, wherein such mixing elements (4) are present.

The Office Action refers to Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 4,5/4,6/5,8/6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA. The limitations of these claims would have been obvious design choices only once the basic apparatus was known. For example, the use of flanges is well known in the mechanical arts and of no patentable merit.

Applicants respectfully disagree and urge that claims 4, 5, 6, and 8 are specific embodiments of the invention and not only obvious design choices. As to claim 4, a flange (8) is clearly a distinguishing constructive element. The disposition of the mixing elements (4) is clearly a distinguishing feature of claim 5 and of claim 6. Claim 8 requires that one injection nozzle (11) is disposed at the product chamber wall (10) and this clearly a distinguishing constructive feature of claim 8.. A recognition of the different invention embodiments and their non-obviousness is respectfully requested.

Claims 2,5/(3,1),6/5,8/6,16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Reed et al. APA does not use Teflon as a coating material. Reed et al shows similar apparatus in which it is disclosed that the mixer can be formed of steel or steel with a Teflon coating. In order to provide for the inherent advantages of using Teflon as a coating material, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify APA by using Teflon as the coating material, taught to be desirable by Reed et al.

The reference Reed et al. in column 6, lines 41 to 44 states as follows: "Specifically, the seal ring 70 can be made from PTFE with a Wolastonite filler and can have an L-shaped (cross-sectional) profile as shown in detail in Fig. 3B." The seal

ring 70 of the Reed et al. reference is adapted to engage the shaft 40 and seal the same while permitting the agitator 30 to rotate (Reed et al., column 6 lines 47 to 49).

Applicants urge that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not apply a material PTFE taught by the reference Reed et al. for use as a seal ring instead for a coating covering the complete mixing shaft (1) of the present application. It is respectfully submitted that the feature of claim 2 of covering the complete mixing shaft (1) with PTFE is outside the scope of the Reed et al. reference.

The exact location of the mixing elements would have been a design choice only based on several factors such as material being treated and desired mixing results.

The location of the mixing elements (4) as claimed in claims 5 and 6 patentably distinguishes over the reference Reed et al., since the Reed et al. reference teaches milling of materials and not mixing of materials.

As to claim 8 requiring that one injection nozzle (11) is disposed at the product chamber wall (10) applicants respectfully submit that such feature is not taught in the reference Reed et al.

Claim 16 as amended requires that “applying a coating (6) with mixing elements (4) onto the structured surface of the steel core (3)”. This required step of claim 16 is nowhere taught or suggested in the reference Reed et al.

The Office Action refers to Conclusion.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The references found by the Office Action show the state of the art at the time of their publication, but they neither anticipate nor render obvious the claims of the present application.

All claims are deemed to be in allowable form and a Notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Reconsideration of all outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Franz Koop et al.

By: 
Horst M. Kasper, their attorney,
13 Forest Drive, Warren, N.J. 07059
Tel.:(908)526-1717 Fax:(908)526-6977
Reg. No. 28,559; Docket No.: SSB202

rep/am